



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

There is in Appendix I a chronological history of archaeological finds: one admires the industry and erudition of the author, but one cannot help wishing some of that energy shown in the collection of such material had gone toward amplifying the exceedingly meager bibliography which only enumerates for the help of the student the most obvious works of reference. Our regret is deepened, because we are sure that the author, in order to write a book which is so packed with valuable information gathered from such various sources, must have had an unusually rich bibliography at his fingers' ends.

E. DOUGLAS VAN BUREN

ROME

Achilles Tatius. With an English translation by S. GASELEE. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Loeb Classical Library, 1917. Pp. xvi+461.

The perpetually renewed vicissitudes and surprises of the somewhat trivially melodramatic amours of Leucippe and Clitophon, the disquisitions on the psychology of love, the rhetorical virtuosity of the descriptions of the pictures of Europa, the rhinoceros, the crocodile, the phoenix and the syrinx, the oratory of the murder trial—all this Mr. Gaselee renders into excellent and readable English. His allusions to “photographs” and “churches” will startle some readers, and his persistent designation of the priest of Artemis as the “bishop” recalls the medieval naïveté of Chaucer's.

How that the bishop as the book can telle
Amphiorax fell through the ground to helle.

Perhaps he is following the Elizabethan translation by W. B(urton) (London, 1597), of which he owns the only existing copy. He frankly admits that a critical edition of the text has yet to be made. His preface discusses the contributions thereto of the three-column fragment published in volume ten of Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* which antedates all extant manuscripts by a thousand years. In a few doubtful passages he offers hesitatingly suggestions of his own or of a friend. But his usual method of dealing with a corrupt or difficult passage, such as the description of the syrinx, is to say that the Greek is very hard and that he has tried to give the general sense. Apart from such passages the translation is substantially correct and there are very few slips. In ii. 4 δέκνειν δὲ ἐλέγχειν βουλόμενον λαθεῖν is not “I . . . have preferred to seem ignorant.” βουλόμενον is the object of ἐλέγχειν. In v. 16. 7 I fear the translator's innocence has been imposed upon. φιλοσοφήσωμεν δὲ γίναι μέχρις λαβώμεθα γῆς is surely not “Let us continue these arguments, dear lady, until we touch land,” but “soyons sage.” Greek is almost as tricky as French. In viii. 6. 5 in

the description of the syrinx $\tauὸ\ δὲ\ ἔσω\ μέσον\ ἐστὶ\ τῷ\ περιττῷ$ is rendered "And the middle one is half way in size between the first and the last." May it not rather be an ingenious way of saying that the innermost is (exactly) the middle by reason of the entire number being odd? Interesting is the coincidence pointed out (viii. 3. 1) between $\piόλεως\ οὐκ\ ἀσήμουν$ and St. Paul's $οὐκ\ ἀσήμουν\ πόλεως$ (Acts 21:39).

The paleographical evidence of the papyrus fragment, Mr. Gaselee thinks, forbids us to date the composition of Clitophon and Leucippe after 300 A.D. If the author was a Christian it must have been late and little. It is more probable that he was a lawyer.

PAUL SHOREY

De Richardo Bentleio atque de ratione eius critica. By THEODORUS LE ROUX. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1916. Pp. 60.

Few doctoral dissertations are epoch-making works, and that by Le Roux is no exception. In the main chapter he attempts to show by a classification of some of the readings defended by Bentley in his *Horace* what Bentley's critical method was. He depends chiefly on Keller and on the *Horazstudien* of Beck. The material is selected, not complete.

Chapter i gives a sketchy account of the great men of Europe living between 1600 and 1800. Mention is made of Milton and Bacon, but not of Shakespeare (perhaps the author believes Bacon wrote "Shakespeare"), of Defoe, Swift, Johnson, but not of Dryden or Pope, etc. The statement is made that at the time of Bentley's birth (1662) more than two centuries had elapsed since the rediscovery of the writings of antiquity. It was, in point of fact, more than three centuries. Le Roux holds that Bentley was concerned with the subject-matter rather than the form of the works which he handled. He quotes from Bentley himself to prove this, but a fuller quotation given in another connection shows that Bentley says that he is concerned only with the correctness of the text, not with the subject-matter.

Chapter ii deals with the influences affecting Bentley's nature, and chapter iii with the edition of Horace and the later works. It is brought out that his confidence in the correctness of his own judgment was due to the acclaim with which his earlier work, especially his edition of Callimachus and his dissertation on the letters of Phalaris, was received and to the continual controversies in which he was engaged as Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. As a result, reckless emendation became a habit with him. Another factor, not mentioned by Le Roux, is implicit in Bentley's own words in the Introduction to his *Horace*. In his day manuscripts were counted, not rated: quantity was the determining factor, not quality.